

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and request reconsideration.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present response after final has been submitted within two months of the issuance of the final Office Action, mailed September 3, 2002. As November 3, 2002 falls upon a Sunday, submission of the present response on November 4, 2002 is within the two month time period. As such, Applicant submits the present response is submitted within sufficient time to warrant the issuance of Advisory Action.

Claims 1, 3-4, 15 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,275,565 issued to Moncrief (hereinafter referred to as "Moncrief"). Applicant respectfully traverses the present rejection and once again maintains the position that the Examiner has improperly asserted the simulated space as disclosed by Moncrief as being equivalent to the claimed first frame of active video. Although Applicant respectfully submits that the present rejection is no longer applicable as claims 1 and 15 have been cancelled.

Applicant herein submits claims 21 and 22 for consideration, wherein claim 21 includes all the limitations of claim 1, as originally presented, and including the limitation of claim 12, to which the Examiner has previously asserted as being allowable in view of the prior art of record.

Applicant further submits claim 22, originally submitted claim 15 including the claimed limitations of claims 16 and 20, which the Examiner has previously indicated as being allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the entrance of newly submitted claims 21 and 22 and the passage of these claims to issuance. Applicant further respectfully submits that the addition of claims 21 and 22 is not a narrowing amendment, but a further delineation of inherently contained features therein, specifically features of claims 1, 12, 15, 16 and 20. Should the Examiner feel the additional claims are a narrowing amendment, Applicant respectfully requests a statement asserting the Examiner's position.

Applicant further respectfully submits amendments to claims 2-3, 8-11, 13 and 17-19, wherein the amendments are merely to provide proper dependency from newly added claims 21 and 22, instead of currently cancelled claims 1, 12, 15 and 16. Applicant further respectfully submits that the amendments to claims 2-3, 8-11, 13 and 17-19 are not narrowing in nature. Should the Examiner feel that these amendments are narrowing, Applicant respectfully requests an explicit statement by the Examiner stating this position.

Applicant further respectfully requests the entrance of added claims 21 and 22 and amended claims 2-3, 8-11, 13 and 17-19 as these amendments do not add any new subject matter, which would thereupon require the Examiner to conduct any further searching. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the submitted amendments are proper in view of the response after final.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the withdrawal of the rejection regarding claims 3-4 and 19 and the passage of claims 21, 3-4 and 22 and 19 to issuance.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moncrief. Applicant respectfully traverses the present rejection in view of the above discussion regarding amended claim 2 and added claim 21, Applicant submits the rejection is improper. As such, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal and the passage of claim 2 to issuance.

Claim 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,574,836 issued to Broemmelsiek (hereinafter referred to as "Broemmelsiek"). Applicant respectfully submits the amendment to claim 14 to obviate several informalities, specifically adding the word "a" for the claimed step of "storing active video data at a first video memory" and inserting the memory modifier the first "video" to the claimed first video memory. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments are not narrowing in nature nor do they add any further patentable subject matter which would require the Examiner to conduct any further prior art searching. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the amendment to claim 14 is proper in view of the response after final, as such Applicant requests entrance of the amendments.

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration regarding the rejection of claim 14 in view of Broemmelsiek. Among other things, it is respectfully submitted that Broemmelsiek fails to disclose "sending the active video data from the first video memory to a second video memory on the location of the active video window is associated with the second video memory." In support of the present rejection, the Examiner asserts that this limitation is disclosed on col. 8, lines 34-36 which provide for the drawing the front object A, D into the second frame buffer unit 62B "in the same way it was drawn into the first frame buffer unit 62A." The Examiner has improperly asserted the teachings of Broemmelsiek as Broemmelsiek fails to disclose the location of the active video window being associated with the second video memory, but rather discloses in response to an expose event, utilizing different frame buffers to

generate graphic primitives that are sent to the graphic engine 60 for rendering an exposed portion of a window or object. Broemmelsiek fails to disclose, *inter alia*, the step of sending the active video data from the first video memory to the second video memory when the location of the active video window is associated with the second video memory, but rather teaches sending the active video data from the first video memory to the second video memory when an expose event occurs, wherein an expose event is inconsistent with the location of the active video window being associated with the second video memory. An expose event is clearly defined by Broemmelsiek as being an event in which a previously obscured portion, such as portion "D" of FIG. 2A and FIG. 2B, becomes visible due to the change of angle of viewing. When the expose event occurs, active video data is not sent from the first video memory to the second video memory, but the object, such as display area "D", is rendered into a frame buffer using transformed display coordinates, step 108 of FIG. 3. As stated in the previous response filed July 10, 2002, Broemmelsiek operates in a completely different manner and utilizes a completely different approach for producing the claimed invention of an interactive display apparatus and method with fewer position compensation.

Applicant also acknowledges that the Examiner has addressed the specific limitation in the response to argument section, found on page 6 of the present Office Action. While Applicant appreciates the Examiner's position, Applicant respectfully maintains that Broemmelsiek does not specifically disclose sending the active video data from the first video memory to the second video memory **when the location of the active video window is associated with a second video memory**. It is respectfully submitted that the location of the active video window is not associated with the second video memory, according to Broemmelsiek, but rather render information is disposed within the second buffer when an expose event occurs, to which Applicant respectfully submits is inconsistent with the claimed limitations of claim 14. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal, the passage of claim 14 to issuance.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5-11, 13, 17 and 20 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicant respectfully submits that, in view of the above discussion related to claims 21 and 22, the objection is improper. As such, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection and the passage of these claims to issuance.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned: "Version with Markings to Show Changes Made."

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Timothy J. Bechen
Registration No. 48,126

Date: November 4, 2002

VEDDER, PRICE, KAUFMAN &
KAMMHOLZ
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 609-7870
FAX: (312) 609-5005

MARKED-UP VERSION TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

Cancel claims 1, 12, 15, 16 and 20, without prejudice.

Please add claims 21 and 22 to read to as follows:

21. (Added 11/4/02) A method of displaying active video on a computer system, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving at a first video graphics adapter (VGA) a first frame of active video from a video source;

rendering at least a first portion of the first frame of video at the first VGA in response to a first control signal, wherein the first control signal is a signal specifying a window location for displaying the active video; and

rendering at least a second portion of the first frame of video at a second VGA in response to a second control signal.

22. (Added 11/4/02) A method of displaying active video on a computer system, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving at a first video graphics adapter (VGA) a first frame of active video from a video source, wherein video source is at least one of the following: a video decoder and a television signal; and

displaying at least a first portion of the first frame of video at a second VGA in response to a second control signal.

Please amend claims 2-3, 8-11, 13-14 and 17-19 to read as follows:

2. (Amended) The method of claim [1] 21, wherein the first portion and the second portion are the same portion.

3. (Twice Amended) The method of claim [1] 21, wherein the step of rendering at least a first portion of the first frame of video at the first VGA includes storing the at least a first portion of the active video in a video memory associated with the first VGA.

8. (Amended) The method of claim [1] 21, wherein the first VGA is a primary VGA, and the second VGA is a secondary VGA.

9. (Amended) The method of claim [1] 21, wherein the first VGA is a secondary VGA, and the second VGA is a primary VGA.

10. (Amended) The method of claim [1] 21, wherein the first VGA and the second VGA are part of a video wall such that the first frame of active video is displayed across multiple displays simultaneously.

11. (Amended) The method of claim [1] 21 further comprising the steps of:
receiving at the second VGA a second frame of active video from a second video source;
and
rendering at least a portion of the second frame of video at the first VGA.

13. (Amended) The method of claim [12] 21 further comprising the step of storing the window location in a preference file.

14. (Twice Amended) A processing system for executing instructions, the processor system comprising instructions for:
monitoring the location of an active video window;
storing active video data at a first video memory; and
sending the active video data from the first video memory to a second video memory when the location of the active video window is associated with the second video memory.

17. (Amended) The method of claim [16] 22, wherein the video decoder is for decoding a compressed video signal.

18. (Amended) The method of claim [16] 22, wherein the method further comprises the video source sending the first frame of data over a bus local to the first VGA.

19. (Amended) The method of claim [15] 22, wherein the method further comprises storing the first frame of active video in a video memory associated with the first VGA.